Fulbright on The Cost of the Cold War, P. 2

Prophetic Warning From One of the Victims in Brazil's Reign of Terror

"This [industrial] development of which we are so proud has brought about no change at all in the living conditions of three-fourths of the country's population. Its main feature has been a growing concentration of income, both socially and geographically. . . . The majority of the Brazilian population has reaped no benefit. . . . Economic development has produced social results of an extremely negative character. Because of the anachronistic structure of Brazilian agriculture, it has led in many regions to a relative increase in the rent from land, thus rewarding parisitic groups. Similarly . . . a variety of subsidies—in the name of development—have very often put a premium on investments which . . . fostered a still greater concentration of income in the hands of privileged groups. . . .

"Over half of the Brazilian population gets its living from the land. If this sector maintains its present rigidity, every peasant movement will tend rapidly to adopt revolutionary techniques of the Marxist-Leninist type. . . . The imposition of a right-wing dictatorship, making the whole political structure rigid, would also create favorable conditions for an effective revolution of the Marxist-Leninist type. . . .

"If we are to avoid dictatorial regimes, whether of a social class or ideological group or rigid party machine, we must (a) prevent all forms of retrogression in our social and political systems and (b) create conditions for fast and effective change in the country's archaic agrarian structure. . . . Political retrogression will not come haphazardly, but as a reflection of panic among some privileged groups. . . . Where structures are rigid, preventing gradual adjustment, these pressures may create cataclysmic situations, leading to emergency solutions or preventive coups."

—Celso Furtado, then Minister of Economic Planning under Goulart, now banned from politics by the military, writing in Foreign Affairs, *April 1963.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 16 APRIL 20, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A New *Alianza* — for Reaction and Revolution

The attitude of the American government on Brazil is a tragedy. In the gigantic struggle now underway between Moscow and Peking for leadership of the revolutionary movement in the colonial world, our government's blind folly aids the Chinese. As Maurice Duverger wrote in an article "End of 'Kennedyism'?" in *Le Monde* April 10, the overthrow of Goulart helps one understand "why Marx wrote a century ago that ruling classes would never accept without violence the loss of their privileges." In a world of thermonuclear weapons, peace is a necessity and peaceful reform its corollary. Revolutionary uprisings in Latin America will poison the atmosphere of politics at home and abroad, making humane policy less likely. The world is sick of hatred and killing, whether among nations, races or classes; the embers have barely cooled in Auschwitz and Hiroshima. Yet now we have made the dispossessed in Brazil and elsewhere feel that their misery cannot be ended without bloodshed. The Kennedy Administration, for all its failings, at least gave them some hope. President Johnson had best stop now and realize that he is extinguishing it.

Even A Token Land Reform

The nature of the new Brazilian regime was made unmistakable by the first act of its military chief, Gen. Branco. This was to cancel Goulart's land reform decree. It would have affected only some 3 percent of Brazil's privately owned land. It was based (*London Financial Times*, April 2) on an unused law 22 years old which allowed the government to requisition land up to 6 miles on either side of all roads, railways and canals. It was the only legal device available to Goulart. *It was not more than a token gesture in a country where 60%* of the people depend on farming for their livelihood but 8% of the landowners own 75% of the tilled land. For years we have been preaching agrarian reform to Latin America. Now we support a military regime which has blocked its first beginnings in Brazil. Last July when the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies was within reach of an agreement on broader measures of land reform, two extreme right wing parties blocked it. The leaders of those parties, Governor Lacerda of Guanabara and Gov. de Barros of Sao Paulo were the chief civilian architects of the anti-Goulart uprising and are now the favorites of U.S. policy. The Roman Catholic Bishops of Brazil issued a collective statement last July in favor of agrarian reform, declaring that payment in bonds rather than cash would not be a violation of property rights. But Goulart's message to Congress March 15 asking a constitutional amendment authorizing such payment was among the excuses for the military take-over.

The constitutional reforms Goulart proposed to Congress would have created a more democratic Brazil. He asked that the literacy test on the right to vote be lifted and that in the Army the non-commissioned officers and privates be given the same right of the ballot now enjoyed only by the officers. Today Brazil though a nation of close to 80 millions has a Congress elected by 11 million. The privileged were especially reluctant to see the vote extended to the lower ranks of the

(Continued on Page Four)

Scholar-Statesman at Work

Mr. John SCALI (ABC State Dept Corr): Do you think that what happened in Brazil advanced the cause of democracy in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. McGeorge BUNDY (Spec. Asst. to the President for International Security Affairs): Yes, I do.

—On ABC-TV's Issues and Answers, April 5.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Second Great Speech by Fulbright: The Cold War in American Life

"Too Much To Pay For Life in a Honky-Tonk"

By Senator William Fulbright *

Of all the changes wrought in American life by the cold war, the most important by far, in my opinion, has been the massive diversion of energy and resources from the creative pursuits of civilized society to the conduct of a costly and interminable struggle for world power. The result has been accumulating neglect of those things which bring happiness and beauty and fulfillment into our lives.

The cold war has put a premium on avoiding innovation at home because new programs involve controversy as well as expense and it is felt that we cannot afford domestic division at a time when external challenges require us to maintain the highest possible degree of national unity. This is the price that we have been paying for the cold war, and it has been a high price indeed.

The Consent of the Misgoverned

At least as striking as the inversion of priorities which the cold war has enforced upon American life is the readiness with which the American people have consented to defer programs for their welfare and happiness in favor of costly military and space programs. Indeed, if the Congress accurately reflects the temper of the country, then the American people are not only willing, they are eager, to sacrifice education and urban renewal and public health programs—to say nothing of foreign aid—to the requirements of the Armed Forces and the space agency. I sometimes suspect that in its zeal for armaments, the Congress tends to overrepresent those of our citizens who are extraordinarily agitated about national security and vigorous about making their agitation known.

Without becoming militarist in the sense of committing themselves to the military virtues as standards of personal behavior, the American people have nonetheless come to place great—and, in my opinion, excessive—faith in military solutions to political problems. We are permitting the vast Military Establishment largely to run itself, to determine its own needs, and to tell us what sacrifices are expected of us.

***Abridged from an address delivered April 5 at the University of North Carolina 1964 Symposium, "Arms and the Man: National Security and the Aims of a Free Society."**

A Malady That Outlived McCarthy

"The fears and passions of ideological conflict have diverted the minds and energies of our people from the constructive tasks of a free society to a morbid preoccupation with the dangers of Communist aggression abroad and subversion and disloyalty at home. The problem did not end with the McCarthy era of a decade ago nor is it confined to the neurotic fantasies of today's radical right. The cold war malady affects a much broader spectrum of American society. It affects millions of sensible and intelligent citizens whose genuine concern with national security has persuaded them that the prosecuation of the cold war is our only truly essential national responsibility."

—Sen. Fulbright at the U. of North Carolina, Apr. 5.

The abnegation of responsibility by the Congress in this field is strikingly illustrated by its debates or, more accurately, nondebates, on the defense budget. When, for example, Senator McGovern, of South Dakota, suggested last September that defense spending might be reduced by five percent, the Senate, with virtually no discussion, voted the McGovern amendment down by a vote of 70 to 2. Again this year, Congress is speeding the enactment of the Defense budget with splendid indifference to its size and content.

Many Americans may regard huge military and space programs as the only truly urgent requirements on our national agenda, but it is difficult to believe that this enthusiasm is shared by the 4.2 million Americans who are unemployed or by the 30 million Americans who have incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

The cold war has diverted us from problems both quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative problem is essentially to devise ways of elevating the one-fifth of our people who live in poverty to the level of the four-fifths who live in greater material abundance than any other society in human history. While the attention and energy of our public policy have been focused through these postwar years on crises in Berlin and Cuba and the Far East, America has been more and more taking on the physical appearance and the cultural atmosphere of a honky-tonk of continental proportions.

FCC Chairman Says TV More Concerned With Its Commercials Than Its Freedom

"During the past year the Commission renewed the licenses of the Pacifica Foundation radio stations which had been on deferred status for over three years. Complaints originally came to the Commission from several sources and varied from disgust over allegedly obscene programming to charges of the possible affiliation of key personnel with the Communist Party.

"When a regulatory agency is called upon to handle allegedly obscene communists, it indeed has a hot potato on its hands. The Pacifica potato was admittedly handled gingerly for too many months, but I am proud that the Commission showed its calluses while I was its Chairman. It issued a forceful, broad-gauged opinion clearing Pacifica of the charges levied against it. In my judgment, this action will stand as a bulwark against the enemies of free broadcasting and free speech.

"At every public meeting of broadcasters I have attended, a speaker has only to declare himself in favor of "freedom" to be rewarded by an automatic burst of applause. If ever there was a time when the freedom of broadcasting was at stake, this was it. Who took action in this case?

"Which State Association sent delegations to Congress charging that the FCC had deferred the Pacifica licenses for an unwarranted period and was operating outside its jurisdiction? Which of you wrote me a letter urging the Commission to dismiss these charges and to reaffirm the Commission's time-honored adherence to the principles of free broadcasting?

"When you display more interest in defending your freedom to suffocate the public with commercials than in upholding your freedom to provide provocative variety—when you cry "Censorship!" and call for faith in the founding fathers only to protect your balance sheet—when you remain silent in the face of a threat which could shake the first amendment's proud oak to its very roots—you tarnish the ideals enshrined in the Constitution."

—FCC Chairman William Henry to the National Association of Broadcasters, April 7 (abridged).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mississippi Appealed to Black's Dissent in the Case of A Negro Communist

Ironic Aspects of the Supreme Court's Decision in Barnett Contempt Case

From a Negro point of view the Supreme Court's decision in the Barnett case must seem another example of how the law somehow bends to the white man. Though the Court 5-to-4 upheld the right to try Governor Barnett and Lt. Gov. Johnson of Mississippi for criminal contempt without a jury, it warned in a footnote that the conviction might be reversed if the penalty imposed were not a "petty" one.

In the perspective of the long struggle to end summary trial without a jury of criminal contempts, this was a gain. For the first time there seems to be a majority on the Court prepared to uphold trial by jury in criminal contempts where substantial penalties are imposed. Negroes may note bitterly that this swing toward the liberal side came in the case of a Mississippi governor whose defiance of Federal law cost two deaths and risked the life of James Meredith.

Red Menace But . . .

The pleadings by the State of Mississippi make curious reading. On the one hand its Attorney General, Joe T. Patterson, invoked the Red menace. If the U.S. may punish the State, he argued, "by unlawfully impeaching, pauperizing and imprisoning the Governor, we need not wait for Communism to destroy our great Constitution." On the other hand, he appealed to Mr. Justice Black's reasoning in a dissent six years ago on behalf of two Communists, one of them a Negro, Henry Winston, who lost his sight under prison treatment.

In that case, *Green v. U.S.*, a majority 5-to-4 upheld 3-year sentences for criminal contempt without a jury trial on Winston and Gil Green for their flight from a Smith Act conviction. Black argued that convictions for criminal contempt without a jury trial were unconstitutional. He led a dissenting minority of four liberals again in defense of Barnett. But this time there was a difference in the outcome. The same majority (except for White) which was willing to uphold a 3-year sentence on the two Communists now warns that it will reverse sentence on Barnett and Johnson unless it is a minor penalty. Otherwise there must be a jury trial.

On this issue Mississippi invoked the history of labor's long fight against "government by injunction." The story of how a Federal judge broke the Pullman strike in 1895 and sent its leader, the Socialist Debs, to jail without a trial is retold in Mississippi's brief with an indignation that comes strangely from the State where labor's rights to this day are least respected.

None of this was really relevant. Nowhere did the pleadings or the court touch on the essential realities. Barnett and Johnson were far more guilty than Green and Winston of conspiring to overthrow the government by force and violence. This was rebellion and Barnett should have been jailed under martial law. In leaving defiance, weakly, to the courts and contempt citation, the government got entangled in the jury trial issue, which was confusing and misleading.

Trial by jury derived from the idea of preventing feudal class oppression by letting a man be judged by his "peers," i.e. his own class. The jury system breaks down where (1) a dominant white majority is determined to oppress a Negro minority and (2) the case involves not enforcement of criminal law but of racial justice. Before a jury of his peers, Barnett was sure of acquittal. Even under this ruling, after some light penalty, he will get away, literally, with murder and emerge a hero.

Better Speak Up Now

Two hundred women from 25 States came to Washington last week to lobby for peace in Vietnam, and heard Senator Gruening (D. Alaska) tell them it is time the U.S. got out of a civil war we should never have entered in the first place. All the polls show the handful of Senators like Gruening who call for peace speak for substantial, perhaps majority, opinion. But unless other organizations follow the example of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and begin sending delegations here, we may plunge further into this war. A Wall St. Journal story (April 13) says the U.S. is already arming the South Vietnamese with bombers that can reach Hanoi and that the decision to let them loose will depend on how the White House sizes up the effect on the election. The Khanh regime is fast falling apart, and the alternative to a negotiated peace is full-scale U.S. entrance into the war. Now's the time to speak up.

How Red Herring and Racism Were Dragged In Against the Landrum (Anti-Poverty) Bill

Mr. REUTHER (UAW): The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. . . . In 1953 the richest 1% of the nation's families got 24% of the family income. In 1955 they got 26%; in 1961, 28%.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (R. N.J.): You can advocate sharing the wealth, Mr. Reuther, but that will not get us to the problem of discussing this bill this morning.

Mr. REUTHER: I am not advocating sharing the wealth. This whole question of how we learn to share abundance is the key to the future of our society.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: I found his statement to be extremely provocative. It smacked to me of socialism, and perhaps this Landrum bill with its billion dollar expenditure will be one small step in that direction.

Mr. REUTHER: I would like to be invited back, if you will give me enough time to have a philosophical discussion about what socialism is. It is quite obvious that you don't understand what socialism is.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN: Is it your feeling that this Landrum bill should be aimed primarily at alleviating the problems of the Negroes?

Mr. REUTHER: Obviously the fight against poverty should be color-blind. But the Negroes, because they have been discriminated against more than any other group, would get a larger benefit out of this because they are the victims of poverty more than any other group.

Mr. LANDRUM (D. Ga): I want to have it clearly understood with reference to this bill under my name, and I am proud to have my name upon it, any assistance that it might be providing towards the Negro race is a source of pride to me. I come from a section of the country that has been bombarded with a great deal of demagoguery. There are many, many Negroes in the country who are poor.

I join the distinguished labor leader here, with whom I have disagreed on many points. I join him in saying that this effort to remove poverty from the American scene must be color blind.

—Before the Senate Educ. & Labor Com., Apr. 9 (abr.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Regime We Hailed as Constitutional Is A Reign of Terror

(Continued from Page One)

armed forces which had developed (as *The Times* of London noted in an editorial April 2) "a strong sense of kinship with the civilian labor movement, increasingly frustrated by economic development which seems always to enrich those who already have enough without doing much for those who have almost nothing." Even with the restricted franchise, when Goulart 16 months ago put to a plebiscite the question of restoring strong presidential powers, he won 9 to 1 over the same military and right wing opposition which has overthrown him. These are the men we praise as defenders of democracy.

Not Smart Politics

Our national leadership must look pretty poor to sophisticated Latin Americans. Why the rush to approve the Brazilian coup d'etat before the situation had clarified? There seem to have been two counter-revolutions. The first was the overthrow of Goulart and his replacement by the president of the Chamber of Deputies, Senhor Mazzili. This could be disguised as constitutional, if you overlooked the fact that the military had deposed the President. This revolt was followed in a few days by a second one, when the Congress refused to grant sweeping purge powers asked of it by the military and Lacerda's extreme right wing party. The first revolt had the support of centrist and moderate right parties. The second did not. The regime as it emerged from the second revolution has the support only of the extreme right and the military. It is so rigid that it is bound to defeat itself. Shrewder middle of the road politicians like former President Kubitschek, who realize that some social reform is necessary, see the U.S. supporting die-hard elements who have only minority support even in the favored classes. The difference between Kubitschek and Lacerda is like the difference between a Taft and a McCarthy, between a thoughtful conservative and an unscrupulous rightist demogague. To put our chips on Lacerda and the military is not smart politics.

No enemy could have hurt us more than our own action in endorsing as constitutional a military regime which has purged one-tenth of the Brazilian Congress, jailed at least two State Governors among thousands arrested, dissolved Peasant League and labor unions in the impoverished northeast, and ended freedom of the press. The military chiefs have imposed an "institutional act" Congress refused to pass. "While the measure is aimed at Communists and leftist extremists," the *Washington Star* explained April 12, "no proof of Red activities is required nor is any judicial appeal provided." This is a reign of terror. The jails are full. Two ships in Rio harbor are being used for the overflow. So is the island of Fernand Noronha, on which we have a tracking station. Johnson, Rusk and McGeorge Bundy hail all this as a triumph of freedom. The leader of the moderate Labor Party in the chamber of Deputies spoke history's verdict when he protested "There is no justice, no law, no order in the Brazilian nation now. It would be better in these circumstances to shut down Congress and do away with this farce of democracy" (London *Times* from Rio, April 6). What he calls farce we call the new Johnsonian pragmatism. As the Scripps Howard man at State Department explained (*Washington Daily News*, April 3) there are "Good military coups as well as bad ones. The one in Brazil this week exemplified the good kind . . . Bad democratic elections as well as good ones. The one in Chile next September may demonstrate that." When we fear the democratic verdict, we invite the military to take over. This is a new Alianza—for reaction and revolution.

Goulart's Own Ignored Defense

Montevideo, Uruguay, April 5 (AP)—Joao Goulart, ousted President of Brazil, said his regime and the reforms it fostered were to prevent a Communist takeover. Asked about charges by those who led the revolt that his government was becoming Communist, Goulart replied: "That was the great banner waved against my government and I was highly mystified."

Action on land expropriation, banking regulations, administrative and taxation changes was "to restrain Communism in Brazil," Goulart declared.

These proposals, he added, were constitutional and were designed to "gain maximum democracy, to defend the popular economy and the poor people of Brazil."

—York, Pa., Gazette & Daily, April 6, the only place we saw this Associated Press dispatch.

Use the Blank Below to Send I. F. Stone's "The Haunted Fifties" as a Graduation Present

I. F. Stone's Weekly **5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.**

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

4/20/64

For this additional $5.35 please send a copy of I. F. Stone's "The Haunted Fifties."

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Newspaper

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED